

DEPARTMENT • OF • WATER • RESOURCES  
**CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN**  
♦ UPDATE 2005 ♦

**Public Process Design Workshop Summary**

**September 14, 2005**

1:00 to 5:00 p.m.

Large Conference Room, Bonderson Building  
901 P Street, Sacramento

**Meeting Purpose:**

- *Prepare Concepts for Next California Water Plan Advisory Committee Process*

**Key Themes:**

- There are two kinds of communities: Communities of Interest (Ag, Urban, Environment, Business, etc.) and Communities of Place (local/regional community networks).
- Communities of Interest may be better served by a central Statewide Committee in Sacramento.
- Communities of Place have unequal resources and geographic distribution. They may be better served by decentralized regional Committees.
- Communities of Interest want access and transparency.
- Communities of Place want autonomy and do not want the legislature to micromanage via mandates.
- The Water Code is quite general (nonspecific) about criteria for what a Water Plan Advisory Committee should look like.
- More public agencies need to be more involved, but the AC may not be the best venue for agency participation.
- Tribes and traditionally underrepresented parties should be invited and kept at the table. Some kind of reimbursement or incentive may be necessary for disadvantaged groups to sustain their participation.
- The current AC lost some of its more deliberative qualities towards the end of the process. In the end, there was increasing reliance on polling for caucus positions and decreasing ability for DWR to respond to more substantive comments.

What is needed:

- Stakeholder representation on two dimensions: Communities of Interest (i.e. all policy interests at the table) and Communities of Place (i.e. all regions at the table).
- A good inventory of what is happening in the regions to recognize and ensure **integration** and **collaboration**.
- A way to represent the variability among regions.
- Recognition that the state is not a bathtub but a system with moving parts.
- Interface with other processes that impact water planning (such as FERC relicensing).
- Focus group polling/dialogues in the different regions.

**Key Questions Raised:**

- Should the regions be defined, at least initially, in the framework of the DWR hydrologic regions? Corollary: *What is a region, and who makes the definition?*
- How should existing planning processes (federal, state and local) be dealt with in the context of the California Water Plan (CWP) regional plan approach?
- Does every planning process have to be referred to or incorporated into the regional planning process? What about those carried out as NGOs such as local watershed groups?
- How would the CWP regional planning process deal with regulatory or quasi-judicial processes within a regional context?
- What is the responsibility or interaction between CWP planning in regions and those carried out by private industry or independently funded processes with a quasi-public purpose?
- What practical effect should a regional plan actually have?
- Will all the CWP regional efforts operate under the same rules and schedules?
- How will areas with limited institutional capacity, but regional planning needs, be incorporated in a process that also includes areas with extensive capacity and experience? Will regions be disadvantaged and if so what then of the legitimacy of the process?
- Within CWP regional efforts shouldn't there be representation of both the communities of place (those who are within the geographic region) and the communities of interest (those who reside elsewhere, or do business else where but who have facilities or assets within the region) in any advisory group?
- Does the DWR have the right structure, funds and authority to carry off an ongoing regional planning responsibility that also would include data management and analysis for all regions?
- The populations and economies of the various regions vary significantly. How will those regions, or sub regions, with lack of fiscal resources be assisted?
- Do you anticipate secondary benefits from this process that are not currently identified by DWR as deliverables and therefore valued?
- Who can legitimately speak for a region as its representative? Corollary: *Who picks the representatives, and what are the selection criteria?*

**Welcome and Greetings, Introductions, Agenda Review, Ground Rules**

Lisa Beutler, meeting facilitator from the Center for Collaborative Policy, CSU Sacramento, welcomed participants to the Public Process Design Workshop and reviewed the meeting agenda and ground rules. The purpose of the workshop was to deliberate on the Advisory Committee process for the next California Water Plan Update.

The meeting would begin with a helpful look at current legislation for context. The discussion would then move toward lessons learned from the existing stakeholder process – those aspects that should be kept and those that should be improved. After a quick review of models used by other states and subject areas, the majority of the time in the afternoon Agenda was reserved for discussion on regional approaches. The last part of the day would focus on the role of the Advisory Committee in the next process.

Lisa acknowledged that while DWR was leading the Water Plan effort, several Advisory Committee members had stated a desire for larger engagement by other state agencies. There had been significant participation from CA Department of Fish and Game and the Department of Food and Agriculture, but

many asked, “where is the State Water Board, where is the Bureau of Reclamation?” There were also several recommendations for an integrated statewide/regional strategy for stakeholder representation.

---

## **Legal Requirements of Advisory Committee Membership**

Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR, briefly summarized the legislative context of the current Water Plan Advisory Committee. In the mid 1990s, Senator Poochigian amended the California Water Code to require an advisory committee. The legislation was nonspecific; it made no mention of a particular role or size. Senator Burton amended the Water Code prior to the current Water Plan Update process. There was a 1 page handout that summarized the advisory committee amendment. In Section 1004(b)(1), it states:

The department shall establish an advisory committee, comprised of representatives of agricultural and urban water suppliers, local government, business, production agriculture, and environmental interests, and other interested parties, to assist the department in the updating of the California Water Plan. The department shall consult with the advisory committee in carrying out this section. The department shall provide written notice of meetings of the advisory committee to any interested person or entity that requests the notice. The meetings shall be open to the public.

### **Key Points:**

- The Water Code remains broad and nonspecific.
- It makes no mention of size.
- It gives only a high-level description of purpose.
- There are more stakeholder interests than are specified in the law.
- There are no criteria with regard to regional representation.

Lisa asked the group if they had any questions on legal requirements.

No questions were asked.

---

## **Lessons Learned from Water Plan Update 2005 (Discussion)**

Lisa Beutler asked the group to reflect upon the lessons learned from the current Advisory Committee. DWR was interested in hearing about things that people felt had worked well and also those things that should be changed for the next Water Plan. Lisa acknowledged that Advisory Committee members had said on many occasions that regional representation was a major concern.

### **DISCUSSION:**

Comment: I thought the internet-based access to all materials was a great improvement that didn't exist at the last B160 process. Back then we did not have the technical ability that we have now, but the internet is obviously the way of today and the future. If there is a way to incorporate web-based meetings in the future, that will be an even greater improvement.

Comment: Given the assumption that we are moving toward regionalism, what typically happens in public processes like this is that some participants have fewer resources than others. They may be able to stay the course for 1 or 2 years, but at some point they lose the staying power and can't make it to the finish line. Many things in Sacramento are decided in the last 5 minutes of a public process. By its

nature, planning at the regions takes place closer to home for those who are in a *community of place* within the region, but it does not necessarily bring together the *communities of interest* for the region.

Comment: In terms of expertise to participate in water planning, community leaders often don't have the capacity to understand how local problems are connected to policy-level decisions. Some thought must be given to how environmental justice is represented. As the process goes regional, we need to be certain that statewide interests, broad public interests, and the variability of water systems are represented.

Comment: It is easy for state agencies and others not to appreciate or understand the state-level obligations involved. Somehow, trustee responsibility has to be included in the Advisory Committee process. This includes obligations to use the best knowledge available and open disclosure of information. As an example, look at CALFED, where a public process was brought to agencies and contractors that had been used to doing business behind closed doors. We have a flooding problem in New Orleans because questions of immense public interest were delayed. Long term representation of long term public interest is important. People who speak up should not be fired by their agencies.

### ***Lessons Learned – Concerns Expressed***

In thinking about the current Advisory Committee, Lisa offered a proposal of continuing with a statewide body but also having a regional structure. Recalling past comments from Advisory Committee members, Lisa said that there were many concerns expressed, particularly:

- Size
- Composition
- Capacity
  - Authority – some members were decision makers, some were not; some members could speak for their entire constituencies, some could not
  - Expertise – technical and policy

### ***Lessons Learned -- Extended Review Forum***

The Advisory Committee members have demonstrated their ability to work together outside of the regular meeting process and to come to a workshop format to hammer out details. They have been skillful in caucus groups. In addition, the current process had a large Extended Review Forum (ERF) which had a different level of engagement. Lisa encouraged ERF members in the group to speak on how they felt about their engagement.

Comment (from an ERF member): I appreciated being incorporated, even if only on the outer ring of the work being done. But there needs to be a better way of incorporating peripheral comments and participation when you get down to the regional level. There needs to be full exchange. When you have that kind of participation, person who joins can more easily bring recommendations and information back to their own policy people. That part of the process could be improved.

Lisa: Do you have particular thoughts, ideas, on what that would look like? What would be different?

Comment: Do not put a hard and firm boundary line around the Advisory Committee. That doesn't work very well from the standpoint of those on the outside who would like to participate. I can see the reason, but it does not send a message that you are inclusive.

Lisa: What change would you recommend?

Comment: Eliminate that hard boundary. Don't know if that makes the process completely unmanageable, but that is my best recommendation.

Comment (from an AC Member): Devils advocate...I understand the concern about the hard line between the Advisory Committee and other parties, but I am not sure how that will sort out within the regions. By their nature, regions will be tapping into people with interest and experience. I'm not sure what that means in terms of AC members, but I've been involved in public processes, some structured, some unstructured. Unstructured processes with changing memberships and less formality take longer. This is not better or worse. To the extent there is an open-ended schedule that is fine. But if you are on a tight schedule, then you need to think about boundaries, or else it would be difficult to get done on time.

Response (from ERF member): I agree removing boundaries poses greater challenges. But consider a loose structure rather than no structure. There can still be rules on a loose structure.

Kamyar Guivetchi responded that, from DWR's point of view, it was important to have a defined process in order to get commitment to do work. The Advisory Committee was asked to do far more work than originally thought. If members weren't identified as being part of a formal Advisory Committee, it would be hard for DWR to look them in the eye and ask for help.

Lisa Beutler said that given what was heard, the existing structure of the Advisory Committee worked well for what they needed to do at the time. It could have been better at some things, but it generally worked.

Comment: Although there were advantages to having a caucus structure, there were also disadvantages. Toward the end, the process tended toward having the different caucuses announce their positions, and that would be all that would happen. The desirable interchange between different interests in the state happened less and less often as the process went along. No one is to blame, but we should think of how to encourage more dialogue than what happened at the end of this process. There should be something better than having different people announce positions in a black hole where the State is no longer in a position to address our substantive comments.

Lisa acknowledged that in the end there were many contributing factors beyond control of the group that constrained the state's ability to respond.

Comment: Fully acknowledge that, but maybe DWR Executive could have been more engaged.

Comment: The size of the Advisory Committee was not a problem because it was kept under control with ground rules and a focus on mutual respect. For someone in an organization that represents the whole state, I joined the Advisory Committee with some assumptions and came out with other ideas due to the diversity of group. The diversity was quite exciting. If we move into a regional mode, there should be parameters for diversity -- although it might be harder to find diversity in the mountain counties. On occasion we need to be reminded of objectives and not ask for things not possible or purposeful to our mission.

Question: Were there representatives from each and every region?

Kamyar: More or less; some regions more and some regions less. There was no representative from North Lahontan, and only one from the North Coast (Arnold Whitridge). We tried, but we did not have participation from all regions.

Comment: I don't know how to go about encouraging that participation, but if the vision is to move forward with regions, then you need to have solid representation from each region, so they can bring the message back.

Comment: Tribal representation disappeared at a certain point. This may have been at the consent of the tribes, but their absence left them without the benefit of knowing what was being done and we were missing input. Not only should they have representatives, but it is important to keep them at the table and make sure they don't disappear.

Comment: The list of Advisory Committee members is a good list, but I agree with the earlier comments that maybe because of the length and frequency of meetings, many groups on the list didn't show up. In the future, have fewer meetings and have meetings that are substantive. One thing that was really helpful for me, participating in other Advisory Committees, was the participation of local government and the input they brought to the discussion.

Comment: It seems that the Advisory Committee may not have been the most appropriate venue for public agency involvement. You are not going to get them to commit to staying on a standing committee. They simply don't have the resources. It is incumbent upon the state to ensure that other state agencies are involved, but I am not sure if an Advisory Committee is the most effective involvement. Have them participate as needed but not as an ongoing committee.

Comment: I am interested in transparency, but I also want encouragement of greater dialogue and activity, and not just competing speeches. Talk together, work through, and combine ideas into better ones.

Comment: If process could find ways to develop middle ground, then it would become more than a sum of its parts.

Comment: It's even more basic than that. You have organizations out there, such as the CA Public Utilities Commission and the State Water Resources Control Board, which could and would benefit greatly from participation in this process. Investor utilities represent 20% of water in CA. I would highly recommend having regulator agencies more involved, if only for the learning process, and I expect that they would contribute as well.

Comment: Think of a way for public agencies to have a bigger stake invested in the process, rather than on the Advisory Committee. Maybe make them part of a DWR technical team.

Lisa: Group did quite well working in Workshop formats. In those settings, we had good participation from state and federal agencies.

Comment: A great way to get the interest of people in San Francisco is to talk about tearing down O'Shaughnessy Dam. They're engaged. Local governments complain that they cannot get fill-in-the-blank agency to participate, but generally speaking they need to see something to bring them to the table. They need to see a benefit, smell money or power, or else be told that they have to be there. Agencies respond based on their missions. It is important to have cross section of members who know how to get agencies to show up. Some agencies won't show up; FERC will not participate in stakeholder processes because of its quasi-judicial processes. They expect us to solve some of their problems. Yes, agencies must be involved, but the last thing we want is a secret society of "ring knockers" of state and federal agencies. Instead, make the process interesting enough and viable enough that managers and decision makers at the regional and district levels commit staff to it. If managers don't see value, then they need to be educated. But, we shouldn't lower the bar for them.

Comment: As a model, look at the Estuary Project. An MOU was developed with federal and state agencies for each region. The federal and state agencies became committed to the process via the MOUs. The lead federal agency was actually responsible to ensure participation for all federal agencies of the MOU. It worked really well in four cities: Denver, Atlanta, Chicago, and San Francisco. We might want to think about using a structure like that.

Comment: Regional capacity is the most serious issue. Some regions have lots of capacity and know how to make themselves heard. The CA Energy Commission has a wonderful model to enable participation.

Comment: Outreach is major concern. We're basically talking to ourselves. I know that DWR is not a marketing firm. Honestly, I'm not proud that only 250 people showed up to the Public Input Workshops in June after all the tremendous work put out by DWR. I might have been happy if we had 2500 people. How do we get people involved and keep them involved? We need to reach out to agencies like CPUC.

Comment: People won't show up if they don't see how it will impact them in the near future. Philosophical and hypothetical discussions don't draw a lot of people. This Advisory Committee spent over a year just to talk about what *is* the plan. I suggest DWR do interim homework to come up with a proposal to present to the Advisory Committee and suggest that Advisory Committee only meet 3 or 4 times a year. In the meantime, it would be useful if DWR visits the different regions to ask them for their input on specific policy issues. Have a dialogue, not necessarily about the numbers but talk about the policy implications. When the Advisory Committee finally meets together in a quarterly meeting, it should talk about policy implications. DWR should outline policy choices and ask for feedback. It is also important to have a facilitation team to clarify dialogue when people of different backgrounds may not mean the same things with same words.

Comment: There is also the complex issue of tribal representatives. Because there are so many different situations, there is really no such thing as "tribal representation."

Comment: Looking back at the five year odyssey, it reminds me of how difficult it was. Everyone has tremendously high expectations. To "fully engage" everybody in a way we can all understand – that is a very high goal. We need to keep expectations in line with what can be a stable process. DWR must really love this process if it means to replicate in 10 different regions. This would be an order of magnitude more difficult. What if DWR is successful on the regional scale? That means having 10 different plans. There needs to be capability to bring them all together and provide consistency in terms of policies and technical assumptions in each region. It seems like we are not there yet in the political arena and certainly not in technical arena. I like the idea expressed of having regions run their own process. DWR won't have the resources to run 10 processes in addition to a statewide committee. Maybe have an MOU that delegates responsibility to the regions if they can meet certain criteria, with incentives to adhere to a central set of guidelines.

Kamyar, after listening to the discussion, raised some points for the group to consider:

*Better coordination between state agencies.* For the next cycle of the Water Plan, DWR Director Snow has indicated that he wants more active joint participation by the CA Department of Fish and Game, the CA Environmental Protection Agency, and other state agencies. This document is more than DWR's water plan. It is the State government's water plan. One model might be that state agencies not be on the Advisory Committee, but that they would be authors on a steering committee. The Advisory Committee would be the non-state stakeholders advising the state.

*Who is representing whom?* It is nice to talk about regional representation, but who will represent the South Coast on the state's advisory committee? That would be an interesting conversation in and of itself. The last thing DWR wants to do is make parallel regional processes that compete or confound with other efforts.

*Who needs to be in the room?* Prior water plans had technical people serving on the Advisory Committee. Many representatives nominated to the current Advisory Committee tend to resemble technical experts, yet the policy issues we now talk about on the Water Plan are on par with those discussed at the CALFED Bay Delta Public Advisory Committee arena. Do we need different levels of representation for different things (computer models vs. policies)? We may need to have multiple entities.

*What is role of the Advisory Committee?* We need to clarify what it means to be on the Advisory Committee, whether on a regional or statewide dimension. It is not an either-or proposition, but rather a question of how to interact and interrelate across time and space. Sometimes it makes more sense to have regional strategy mixes, and then put them together. Then you identify potential for conflicts and synergies.

---

## **Models Used by Other States, Government Bodies, Models Used in Other Subject Areas**

### ***Texas State Water Plan***

Kamyar: Texas legislation in the late 1990s required the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB), Texas' counterpart to DWR, to create a Texas state water plan with a regional dimension. The legislation also gave the TWDB the authority to establish 16 regional groups. There was a protocol on regional work. For the first 3 years of a 5-year process, the work was regionally focused. They developed regional water demand forecasts. They came up with project-level activities that would be implemented to meet those demand numbers. Significantly, Texas legislation provides for enforcement mechanisms if a project is not on the regional plan; projects are ineligible for state funding and cannot get a permit.

The last 2 years of the 5-year process involve combining and reconciling the different regional plans. There is a detailed database of each region. It is a top down process, with carrots and sticks. Texas has completed its first full cycle and is now in their second cycle of state water planning in this new way.

### **DISCUSSION:**

Question: How does Texas resolve issues of inconsistency?

Kamyar responded that the data is reconciled during the last 2 years of the 5-year cycle. He was unfamiliar with the exact logistics involved.

Comment: It seems that California has been doing water planning long enough for other regions to know where other regions stand with respect to water supply and reuse. The system is so far developed, we have already gone down that path.

Comment: Many local governments don't know what local government has planned, never reconciled discrepancies with their county borders. While we may know regional arrangements in terms of water exchanges in the past, I am not sure anyone has taken a 21<sup>st</sup> century assumption look at a county-by-county basis.



Comment: There is nothing to stop us from having a Texas style processes. That is a technical process within a stakeholder process.

Kamyar asked an additional question:

*What is a region?* The issue of definition is becoming clearer as we look at Prop 50, Chapter 8 grant proposals. Other states sent down mandates. Do we need to look at a more organic method? For regions that didn't evolve organically, the states usually defined regions by hydrologic basin. Texas carried its top-down model to the technical side, developing groundwater models for each of the basins, groundwater, and surface water inflows

Comment: I am convinced that a top down approach won't work, particularly in a large metropolitan area, or those regions that already have strong identities already and technical capacity. There is also another way to look at this., both bottom up and top down approach is expectation to meet somewhere in the middle. You might think about building upon existing experience rather than create something new. It would be difficult to manufacture a new regional process when years of work are already under way by regions.

Comment: I agree. There are many places where there is regional cooperation that does not mirror DWR's hydrological boundaries. There are examples of where water users have worked across boundaries to solve issues in cooperative ventures between local communities and federal agencies. Metropolitan Water District has done good work in south state. If DWR were to make a new model, it would unwind the progress made so far.

Grass roots work well until the last minute when you get to Sacramento or Washington. The only way the bottom up approach will work is to bear in mind term limits in Sacramento. Short memories need reeducated. If we expect DWR to do the education, we will be disappointed. Rather than send DWR across the state, it would be better to fund regional entities to learn from other regions.

Kamyar: One of the initiatives of this CA Water Plan Update is for the State to promote Integrated Regional Water Management. The State is already undertaking the Proposition 50 Chapter 8 grant process. We may want to approach how we can develop this process to provide impetus, guidelines, and region-specific assistance. One-size-fits-all won't work. There are different capacities and experiences, so perhaps the State can build capacity in a customized way via MOUs.

Comment: It is easy for groups within a region to develop antagonistic preconceptions of other regions and their motives. Cross pollination of ideas between regions is extremely important, especially in state this big. It is like people in North Carolina trying to figure out what people in upstate New York are thinking.

### ***CA Energy Commission Integrated Energy Policy Report***

At this point Lisa acknowledged that staff members from the California Energy Commission (CEC) were in the room and asked they wanted to speak about their public involvement processes.

Kay Lewis, CEC, spoke of successful interagency collaboration on the Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR). While the CEC did not have a regional structure, legislation in 2002 mandates the Commission to work with the Independent State Operator (ISO) and the Public Utilities Commission (PUC). There is now unprecedented cooperation between those agencies. They are using each other's products more than ever. The CEC, ISO, and PUC are still not integrated, but they are much closer than before. Although

legislation indicated a need for public participation, it did not mandate an Advisory Committee. However, there has been recent talk about starting an Advisory Committee that operates like the Water Plan Advisory Committee. The CEC has been working closely with DWR, and there will be even more integration of work in the next Water Plan update.

Nick Bartsch, CEC, said public participation in the Energy Commission is relatively new. There has been a 30 year history of public participation, but it was limited to CEC's siting process. They would like to expand the public participation process to other programs at the Energy Commission. The IEPR is the first major attempt, and it has been successful with a phenomenal number of workshop and public participants. They would still like even more participation from the general public and not just stakeholders with vested interest; lately, they have had a broader range of public participation. Opening the process to everyone is slowing things down. By trying to make sure everyone is heard, they have run into logistical difficulties. The Commissioners are committed to having a public process.

### ***State GIS Council***

Lisa Beutler gave a quick overview of the State GIS Council as an alternative stakeholder regional representation model. Although the subject matter was very different from the Water Plan, the philosophical perspective was similar. State Council for GIS had executive sponsorship. Because of the high-profile sponsorship, it was able to ensure consistent participation. At the federal level, there were highly ranked officials in the process. The state's role was to set broad policy and data standards. Rather than crafting a brand new process, it allowed groups to self organize. The council decided it was not essential for every region to be fully represented.

Basically, the GIS Council allowed different regions to form. It was okay for each region to be different as long as it met the standard criteria. This process has been highly successful. This model is starting to be adopted in other states.

Comment: To the extent that we have integrated resource plans out there, DWR should look at what made them work. What worked in one part of the state won't work in another. As we worked on B160, life went on and all kinds of planning went on. IRPs were done in the meantime. We should check to see what they learned. Go back and look at Feather River IRP, all elements from federal land reservations to private utilities in place. If we have any role for DWR Executive Right now, it is educational. They need to know what is in place, what worked, and what lessons were learned and applied.

Comment: The Advisory Committee should not get in the middle of the planning structure. Autonomy is important... DWR might consider a small central advisory committee, maybe 2 or 3 from each interest area, then we have a regional planning advisory committee that would involve primarily locals but also membership from other disciplines that would like to participate.

---

### **Regional Approach (Discussion)**

- **Implications**
- **Goals and Outcomes of Regional Approach**

Lisa Beutler asked the group to think about what they would want from a regional approach for stakeholder participation in the next Water Plan Update.

The following questions were submitted by one Advisory Committee member for DWR's consideration:

1. Should the regions be defined, at least initially, in the framework of the DWR hydrologic regions?
2. How should existing planning processes (federal, state and local) be dealt with in the context of the Bulletin 160 regional plan approach?
3. Does every planning process have to be referred to or incorporated into the regional planning process? What about those carried out as NGOs such as local watershed groups?
4. How would the CWP regional planning process deal with regulatory or quasi-judicial processes within a regional context?
5. What is the responsibility or interaction between CWP planning in regions and those carried out by private industry or independently funded processes with a quasi-public purpose?
6. What practical effect should a CWP Regional Plan actually have?
7. Will all the CWP regional efforts operate under the same rules and schedules?
8. How will areas with limited institutional capacity, but regional planning needs, be incorporated in a process that also includes areas with extensive capacity and experience? Will regions be disadvantaged and if so what then of the legitimacy of the process?
9. Within CWP regional efforts shouldn't there be representation of both the communities of place (those who are within the geographic region) and the communities of interest (those who reside elsewhere, or do business else where but who have facilities or assets within the region) in any advisory group?
10. Does the DWR have the right structure, funds and authority to carry off an ongoing regional planning responsibility that also would include data management and analysis for all regions?
11. The populations and economies of the various regions vary significantly. How will those regions, or sub regions, with lack of fiscal resources be assisted?
12. Do you anticipate secondary benefits from this process that are not currently identified by DWR as deliverables and therefore valued?

Question: With respect to urban water management plans (UWMPs) submitted by water retailers, do they go to DWR Districts or to headquarters in Sacramento?

Response: They go to the DWR Office of Water Use Efficiency and Transfers, at headquarters.

Comment: Retailers invest a lot in their UWMPs. They become almost like Master Plans. It is important to look at who the retailers and wholesalers are in the regions and build regional plans based on urban water management plans as a starting point. Leverage the UWMPs. That way you can see the vision of local water agencies.

Comment: UWMPs work well for the Urban Areas. That is 15% of the demand. But what about agricultural water?

Comment: There is inherent difficulty when DWR looks at different plans they use different definitions. The UWMPs call for agencies to evaluate their water reliability in a single dry year, but they use different reference years. Metropolitan Water District of Southern CA uses 1977, San Diego uses 1967, and Orange County uses the late 1980s.

Lisa: It seems like the goal is *better integration*.

Comment: First, regional plans must be useful to the regions. They must have a substantial role in defining them. They have to meet regional needs. Second, the regions want statewide implications for

funding. Third, the process will need transparency, documentation, guarantees of participation, and coordinated timing.

There needs to be an accounting perspective at the state level, and quality control at the local level. There needs to be an inventory of perceived regional and local problems, an inventory of water resources (flows and stocks), facilities, policies, and roles. Identify what the implications are of numbers as move up from local to regional to state. Otherwise, it will be simply a collection of policy poetry.

Comment: I am concerned that regional planning process could be open to mischief; there are already instances where the Legislature has weighed in requiring certain elements. I would not want a process where we at regional level create a decent plan, when the Legislature has its own ideas of what needs to be done but is not in our interest to do. I have concerns about formulating a process that won't bite us on the rear end.

Lisa: It sounds like focus groups in regions might make sense.

Comment:: Yes, have a focus group discussion with the larger group here, think through the vision of what the group would be, so we don't go too far down pathway of creating pen to paper documents without thinking through how documents could be used against us.

Lisa: This meeting is purely for brainstorming. We can entertain straw proposals.

Comment: I agree about possibility for mischief in regional plans, but we know that there is stress in the system; the slack is gone. Communities of place and interest are emerging that used to simmer below the surface. That is not mischief. That is evolution.

Comment: Avoid a situation where state legislation grabs the steering wheel and takes it out of our hands.

Comment: There are many water planning documents proposed to be developed without any cross communication or balanced representation. A regional plan and inventory are not only excellent ideas; they are necessary. Right now it is total chaos. How it is used and who is using it is critically important; many proposals put forward are not by public agencies and not subject to the public process. It takes time and money for professors and students to participate, but the necessary scientific balance is not there. Who is sitting at the table? Grass roots have no financial abilities to come to the table. If you want them to participate, you need accommodate them.

Often we (grassroots community organizations) are asked to rubber stamp already approved plans. To be shown a PowerPoint presentation without really being asked for our input, that is really getting old. There needs to be genuine out-of-meeting participation.

Comment: One of the things that local governments can do is pry open some of the processes.

Comment: It is important to know not only who is at table but who is *not* at the table. For example, an independent groundwater pumper has no organizational structure, but they need to be represented. That may vary from region to region.

Lisa: Various regions needs are so dramatically different. Many people are not represented by organized entities. In highly urbanized regions like the South Coast, organization representation may be more appropriate. The idea is that be some minimum threshold of standardization balanced against the concerns of oversubscribed commitment or unintended consequences.

Comment: I agree with the concerns about capacity. Smaller nonprofit organizations don't have the resources to get to Sacramento for every meeting. It is challenging to be on an Advisory Committee for years. Solutions could be reimbursement for travel, stipends for participation, or having an empowered person designated to represent the underrepresented.

Comment: There is a community of place vs. community of interest. Some NGOs and the general public cannot always go to Sacramento. The people disadvantaged by regional planning are communities of interest. On the other hand, most of the resources and capacity is concentrated with communities of interest rather than communities of place. I don't think it would be a hardship on water and utility agencies.

Comment: Metropolitan Water District is now looking at doing a Facility Integration Plan. This goes beyond water resources and involves integration of operational issues, even emergency issues,

A regional approach is a very difficult issue to think through; we need to be careful. It is too easy to suddenly be constrained by rules to do this and that to satisfy the state legislature.

Bring some of the statewide policy issues to the regions and listen to their perspective on how to address or look at issues. That is different than having separate regional processes.

It is very scary, even with focus groups. When people don't see their specific recommendation put forward exactly as they worded it, their perception is that they haven't been heard. That is the kind of reactions that you can expect to get.

Lisa: Sounds like you have empathy for what Kamyar has been going through.

Comment: Whenever you bring the full range of stakeholder groups, getting buy-in on regional plans won't be easy.

Kamyar, after listening to the discussion, raised some points for the group to consider:

- *As we think of many questions and options, it is helpful to put them in the context of the framework of Water Plan deliverables, specifically Water Plan outputs such as the Water Portfolios, Future Scenarios, and Regional Response Packages.*
- *It is a given that we will have an Advisory Committee. The next Advisory Committee should have stronger connections to regions, so we can continue to improve our regional reports.*
- *How can we leverage ongoing local/regional activities and work done to get regional info in Water Plan? The next Water Plan Update may be due in 2008; that would mean only 2 years for staff to do content work.*

Comment: When you go through a local/regional process, you tend to get synergy: new communication skills and a common dialogue. The mere presence of unusual folks because of communities of interest (rather than communities of place) creates another educational dialogue. Second thing, if you do it right, the process will create shuttle diplomats who go between DWR and the regions. I'm not sure if this diplomat will be DWR staff or an AC member, but it will bring a big benefit to the administration and Legislature.

Comment: Yes most cases. There can also be cases of meltdown. I could think of water districts that border each other that an enmity of location.

Lisa: Interesting point. What do you do when regions have unequal representation in a statewide system? Do you shore them up?

Comment: There will be some instances when people refuse to cooperate. Then the statewide plan will have a hole.

Comment: There will be a bit of biological selection. Some dinosaurs will stumble and die...

---

### **Role of the Current AC in the New Process (Discussion)**

In wrapping up the meeting, Lisa Beutler asked members of the Advisory Committee what they saw as their role in the next process. Advisory Committee members stated that without knowing what the next process would look like, they could not make definite commitments from organizations to be on a long term, statewide Advisory Committee. Generally, Advisory Committee members indicated that they would continue to be involved via the regional process in whatever form it would take during the next Water Plan Update.

It was agreed that there would be a follow up meeting to continue the discussion of state / regional integration and regional representation.

---

### **Summary, Thank You, and Adjourn**

#### Action Items

- Set up another workshop to continue discussion on State/Regional Integration for the next Water Plan Update.
- Set up regional focus groups for DWR to solicit input from the regions about what stakeholder processes would work for them.
- Ask Advisory Committee members what things DWR wants from them for the next process.

**Attendance:**

Ariel Ambruster, UC Berkeley  
Nick Bartsch, California Energy Commission Public Adviser's Office  
Kirk S. Brewer, California Water Association  
Merita Calaway, California State Association of Counties  
Kristin Carter, CSU Chico / Big Chico Creek Watershed Alliance  
Grace Chan, The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
Krista Clark, Association of California Water Agencies  
Alicia Dean, Environmental Justice Coalition for Water  
Lloyd Fryer, Kern County Water Agency  
Darcy Hawk  
Barbara Hennigan, Butte County League of Women Voters  
Jeffrey Hughes, California Urban Water Conservation Council  
Ron Jacobsma, Friant Water Authority  
Kae Lewis, California Energy Commission  
Jay Lund, UC Davis  
Ken McGhee, Center for Collaborative Policy  
John S. Mills, Regional Council of Rural Counties  
Lucas Munoz, DWR – State Water Project Analysis Office  
Darnell Shaw, Darnell Shaw Environmental  
Jordan Smith, EIP Associates  
Bernice Sullivan, Friant Water Authority  
Amelia Szczepankowzka  
Judie Talbot, Center for Collaborative Policy  
Kathleen Van Velsor, Association of Bay Area Governments  
Mike Wade, California Farm Water Coalition  
Michael Warburton, Public Trust Alliance  
Arnold Whitridge, Trinity County  
Carolyn Yale, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

**Staff:**

Lisa Beutler, CCP  
Barbara Cross, DWR  
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR  
Jennifer Kofoid, DWR  
Elizabeth Patterson, DWR  
David Sumi, CCP

This document is available online at the CA Water Plan website:  
<http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov>